

## REMARKS

### **I. Summary of Office Action**

In the office action mailed June 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 17, 19-22, 25, 27-32, 36, 39-40, 52-53, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Susskind, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0046366 (hereinafter Susskind).

### **II. Status of Claims**

Pending are claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, and 55-56. In this response, Applicants has amended claims 27, 53, and 55.

### **III. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Independent Claims 13 and 52 require the claimed system to “replicate a corresponding interface of the digital video recorder.” To “replicate” is to provide an exact “duplicate” or “copy” the DVR interface. (See [www.dictionary.com](http://www.dictionary.com) 1. To duplicate, copy, reproduce, or repeat. 2. *Biology* To reproduce or make an exact copy or copies).

In contrast, prior to this amendment Claims 27, 53 and 55 called for the system to “simulate the interface of at least one digital video recorder.” A simulation means to create a model or representation of the DVR’s interface, but does not precisely replicate the DVR interface. The cited prior art Susskind reference expressly acknowledges that its screens are merely “a simulation of the Video Recorder Device 20 on-screen interface, but *not necessarily visually identical to each other.*”). Para. [0035]. Susskind thus makes clear that its disclosed simulation is simply a model or representation, not a replica as Applicants claims require.

With the amendments of this response, each of the currently pending independent claims, claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 replicate the DVR interface, not merely simulate it. Applicants’ claimed web interface is a duplicate of the interface of the digital video recorder, i.e., an exact

copy, not merely a simulation. In contrast to Applicants' present claims, Susskind fails to teach or suggest "replicating" the particular interface of the digital video recorder. Instead, Susskind expressly recognizes its interface is not an replica. Para. [0035].

## **V. Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, each of the pending claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, and 55-56 are allowable over the cited references. Independent claims 13, 52, already required the web interface to "replicate" the DVR interface and independent claims 27, 53 and 55 now have been amended to require replication, not a mere simulation. Because each of the independent claims are allowable, all of the dependent claims are allowable as well.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the current rejections. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 23, 2008

/George I. Lee/

George I. Lee

Reg. No. 39,269